arXiv:1605.09403v1 [math.CO] 30 May 2016

Subword Complexity and (non)-automaticity of certain completely multiplicative functions

YINING HU
CNRS, Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu-PRG
Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Case 247
4 Place Jussieu
F-75252 Paris Cedex 05 (France)
yining.hu@imj-prg.fr

Abstract

In this article, we prove that for a completely multiplicative function f from $\mathbb{N}^*$ to a field K such that the set

$$\{p \mid f(p) \neq 1_K \text{ and } p \text{ is prime}\}$$

is finite, the asymptotic subword complexity of f is $\Theta(n^t)$, where t is the number of primes p that $f(p) \neq 0_K, 1_K$. This proves in particular that sequences like $((-1)^{v_2(n)+v_3(n)})_n$ are not k-automatic for $k \geq 2$.

Keywords. Completely multiplicative functions; k-automatic sequences; subword complexity.

1 Introduction

The subject of this article is the subword complexity and (non-)automaticity of certain completely multiplicative functions. From the definition we see that a completely multiplicative function is completely determined by its value on prime numbers.

We recall the definition and a few results about subword complexity and automaticity. The proof of Theorem 1 can be found for example in Chapter 10 of [2], and the proof of Theorem 2 can be found in [3].

Definition 1. Let $\mathbf{u}$ be a infinite sequence of symbols from an alphabet. We define the subword complexity $p_{\mathbf{u}}(n)$ of u to be the number of different factors (consecutive letters) of length n in $\mathbf{u}$.

Theorem 1 (Morse and Hedlund [4])**.** *A sequence* $\mathbf{u}$ *is ultimately periodic if and only if there exists a non-negative integer* k *such that* $p_{\mathbf{u}}(k) \leq k$.

We recall one of the equivalent definitions of an k-automatic sequence.

Definition 2. Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. A sequence $\mathbf{u}$ is called k-automatic if there is a finite set of sequences containing $\mathbf{u}$ and closed under the operations

$$(v(n))_n \to (v(kn+r))_n, \quad \text{for } r = 0, ..., k-1.$$

Lemma 1. *Let* $\mathbf{u} = (u_n)_{n\geq 0}$ *be a* k*-automatic sequence, and let* ρ *be a coding. Then the sequence* $\rho(u)$ *is also* k*-automatic.*

We recall some asymptotic notations for asymptotic complexity:
$f(n) = O(g(n))$: f is bounded above by g (up to constant factor) asymptotically;
$f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$: f is bounded below by g (up to constant factor) asymptotically;
$f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$: f is bounded both above and below (up to constant factors) by g asymptotically.

Theorem 2. (Cobham) *If a sequence* $\mathbf{u}$ *is* k*-automatic, then* $p_{\mathbf{u}}(n) = O(n)$.

Theorem 3 (Cobham)**.** *Let* $k, l \geq 2$ *be two multiplicatively independent integers, and suppose the sequence* $\mathbf{u} = (u(n))_n \geq 0$ *is both* k*- and* l*-automatic, then* $\mathbf{u}$ *is ultimately periodic.*

As a first example we can consider a completely multiplicative sequence $(u(n))_n$ that takes values in $\mathbb{R}$ such that $u(2) = -1$, and $u(p) = 1$ for all $p \in \mathbb{P}\backslash\{2\}$, where $\mathbb{P}$ denotes the set of prime numbers. Then we have for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $u(n) = (-1)^{v_2(n)}$, where v_p is the p-adic valuation. This sequence is 2-automatic, for we have

$$u(2n) = -u(n),$$

$$u(2n+1) = 1.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbf{u}$ is not ultimately periodic. Thus by Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, we have $p_{\mathbf{u}}(n) = \Theta(n)$. In general, for all prime p, the sequence $((-1)^{v_p(n)})_{n\geq 1}$ is p-automatic and has asymptotic subword complexity $\Theta(n)$.

For a more interesting example, consider the completely multiplicative sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a(n))_{n\geq 1}$ taking values in $\mathbb{R}$ such that $a(2) = a(3) = -1$, and $a(p) = 1$ for $p \in \mathbb{P}\backslash\{2, 3\}$. Intuitively this sequence cannot be k-automatic: if $\mathbf{a}$ is 2-automatic then there is no reason why it should not be 3-automatic, but $\mathbf{a}$ is not ultimately periodic (which we will prove later), so by Theorem 3, $\mathbf{a}$ cannot be at the same time 2- and 3-automatic. It can be shown that $\mathbf{a}$ is not 6-automatic, and there is no reason for $\mathbf{a}$ to be k-automatic for k other than 2, 3 or 6 either. Indeed, we will prove in the Section 2 that the subword complexity of $\mathbf{a}$ is $\omega(n^2)$, which implies by Theorem 2 that it cannot be k-automatic. In Section 3 we a general result.

2 The example of $(-1)^{v_2(n)+v_3(n)}$

In this section we prove that the asymptotic subword complexity of the sequence $(u(n)))_{n\geq 1} = ((-1)^{v_2(n)+v_3(n)})_{n\geq 1}$ is $\Theta(n^2)$.

It is easy to see that since $\mathbf{u}$ is the product of two sequences $((-1)^{v_2(n)})_{n\geq 1}$ and $((-1)^{v_3(n)})_{n\geq 1}$, both of which have asymptotic subword complexity $\Theta(n)$, the asymptotic subword complexity of $\mathbf{u}$ is $O(n^2)$. Indeed, we have the following lemma:

Lemma 2. *Let the function* $f_0(n)$ *be the product of functions* $f_1(n)$, $f_2(n)$,..., $f_k(n)$. *Then for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $p_{f_0}(n) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_{f_i}(n)$.

Proof. Let $F_{i,n}$ be the set of factors of length n of f_i. There is an surjection from $\prod_{i=1}^{k} F_{i,n}$ to $F_{0,n}$. □

We recall Bézout's Lemma in the form that we need:

Lemma 3 (Bézout)**.** *Let* n *be an integer and let* p *and* q *be coprime integers. Then*

$$\{k \cdot p - l \cdot q \mid k, l \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } k, l > n\} = \mathbb{Z}.$$

The usual form of Bézout's Lemma says that if p and q are coprime integers, then

$$\{k \cdot p - l \cdot q \mid k, l \in \mathbb{Z}\} = \mathbb{Z}.$$

We may assume that $k, l > n$ by replacing, when this is not the case, (k, l) by $(k+m\cdot q, l+m\cdot p)$, for an integer m large enough.

Now we prove that $p_{\mathbf{u}}(n) = \Omega(n)$.

First, in order to isolate $v_2(n)$ and $v_3(n)$, we consider the subsequences $(a(n))_n = (u(3n+1))_n = ((-1)^{v_2(3n+1)})_n$ and $(b(n))_n = (u(2n+1))_n = ((-1)^{v_3(2n+1)})_n$. By Lemma 5 in Section 3 we know that $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are not ultimately periodic. Therefore, $p_{\mathbf{a}}(n) > n$ and $p_{\mathbf{b}}(n) > n$ by Theorem 1. This mean that there exist $n+1$ factors of length n in $\mathbf{a}$ (resp. $\mathbf{b}$), which we denote by $A_0, A_1, ..., A_n$ (resp. $B_0, B_1, ..., B_n$) and by $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n$ (resp. $\beta_0, \beta_1, ..., \beta_n$) their starting position in $\mathbf{a}$ (resp. $\mathbf{b}$). We choose an integer N such that these factors are contained in the initial segment of length N in $\mathbf{a}$ or $\mathbf{b}$ respectively.

In the next step, for $(i, j) \in \{0, 1, ..., n\}^2$, we want the scattered subwords A_i and B_j to occur "in the same place" in the original sequence $\mathbf{u}$, such that they would form distinct factors U_{ij} of $\mathbf{u}$. While this does not happen for all couples (i, j), we will show in the following lines that it is true for at least $\lceil (n+1)^2/6 \rceil$ couples in $\{0, 1, ..., n\}^2$. First we remark that the factors $A_0, A_1, ..., A_n$ (resp. $B_0, B_1, ..., B_n$) recur periodically in $\mathbf{a}$ (resp. $\mathbf{b}$). This is due to the property of the p-adic valuation that

$$v_p(m) > v_p(n) \Rightarrow v_p(m+n) = v_p(n).$$

Thus, let M be an integer such that $M > v_2(3n+1)$ and $M > v_3(2n+1)$ for all $n \in \{0, 1, ..., N-1\}$. Then for all integer k and all $n \in \{0, 1, ..., N-1\}$, we have $\mathbf{a}(n+k\cdot 2^M) = \mathbf{a}(n)$ and $\mathbf{b}(n+k\cdot 3^M) = \mathbf{b}(n)$. Therefore the set of starting positions of the factor A_i in $\mathbf{a}$ include

$$\{\alpha_i + k \cdot 2^M | k \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

and the set of starting positions of the factor B_j in $\mathbf{b}$ include

$$\{\beta_j + l \cdot 3^M | l \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

In the original sequence $\mathbf{u}$, the set of starting positions of the scattered subword A_i include

$$\{3\alpha_i + 3k \cdot 2^M + 1 | k \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

and the set of starting positions of the scattered subword B_j in $\mathbf{u}$ include

$$\{2\beta_j + 2l \cdot 3^M + 1 | l \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

By Lemma 3, the set

$$\{3k \cdot 2^M - 2l \cdot 3^M | k, l \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{6(k \cdot 2^{M-1} - l \cdot 3^{M-1}) | k, l \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{6z | z \in \mathbb{Z}\} \tag{1}$$

There exist $r \in \{0, 1, ..., 5\}$ such that

$$\text{card}(\{(i, j) \in \{0, ..., n\}^2 \mid 2\beta_j - 3\alpha \equiv r \mod 6\}) \geq \lceil (n+1)^2/6 \rceil.$$

This, combined with equation 1, means that for at least $\lceil (n+1)^2/6 \rceil$ couples (i, j) , there is an occurence of A_i and an occurence of B_j in $\mathbf{u}$, such A_i starts r letters before B_j. This gives at least $\lceil (n+1)^2/6 \rceil$ distinct factors of $\mathbf{u}$ of length $\max\{3n-2, r+2n-1\}$, which proves that the asymptotic subword complexity of $\mathbf{u}$ is $\Omega(n^2)$, which implies by Theorem 2 that $\mathbf{u}$ is not automatic.

3 The general case

To study the general case, we need the following generalization of Lemma 3:

Lemma 4. *Let q_0, q_1,...,q_n be pairwise coprime integers. Let l_1,...,l_n be integers. Then exists positive integers k_0, k_1,...,k_n such that for all $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$, $k_0 q_0 - k_i q_i = l_i$.*

Proof. We prove this by induction.

By Lemma 3 we know that there exist k_0 and $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k_0 q_0 - k_1 q_1 = l_1$.

Suppose that for an integer $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$, we have proven that there exist k_0, k_1,...,k_j such that for all $i \in \{1, ..., j\}$, $k_0 q_0 - k_i q_i = l_i$. If $j = n$ we are done. Otherwise by the pairwise coprime assumption and Lemma 3 we know that there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k'_{j+1} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$k(q_0 q_1 ... q_j) - k'_{j+1} q_{j+1} = l_{j+1} - k_0 q_0.$$

That is,

$$q_0(k_0 + k(q_1 ... q_j)) - k'_{j+1} q_{j+1} = l_{j+1}$$

For $i = 0, 1, ..., j$, we define k'_i as $k_i + k \cdot \prod_{m=0, m \neq i}^{j} q_m$. Then k'_0, k'_1,...,k'_{j+1} satisfy the condition that for all $i \in \{1, ..., j+1\}$, $k'_0 q_0 - k'_i q_i = l_i$.

□

We introduce the following lemma before proving our main theorem.

Lemma 5. *Let a be an element of finite order different from the identity element in a multiplicative group G. Let p be a prime number. Let q and b be positive integers such that $p \nmid q$. Then the sequence $(u(n))_n := (a^{v_p(qn+b)})_{n \geq 0}$ is not ultimately periodic.*

Proof. Suppose that $(u(n))_n$ were ultimately periodic and let T be a period of $(u(n))_n$. We write T as $p^k \cdot T'$ where $k = v_p(T)$ and $p \nmid T'$. We claim that there exists an integer m larger than the length of the initial non-periodic segment of $\mathbf{u}$ such that $v_p(qm + b) = k + 1$. In fact, since q and p^{k+1} are coprime, by Lemma 3 we know that there exists integers m, n large enough to be in the periodic part of $\mathbf{u}$ such that

$$n \cdot p^{k+1} - m \cdot q = b.$$

Furthermore, we can assume that $p \nmid n$, by eventually replacing (m, n) by $(m + p^{k+1}, n + q)$ when this is not the case. Thus we have $v_p(qm + b) = v_p(n \cdot p^{k+1}) = k + 1$. We also have $v_p(q(m + T) + b) = v_p(qm + b + qT) = k$. Therefore $u(m) = a^{k+1} \neq a^k = u(m + T)$ since a is not the identity element, which contradicts the definition of m and T. Therefore $(u(n))_n$ cannot be ultimately periodic. □

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u(n))_{n \geq 1}$ be a completely multiplicative sequence taking values in a field K. We suppose that the number of prime numbers p such that $u(p) \neq 1_K$ is finite. Let t be the number of primes p such that $u(p) \neq 1_K, 0_K$. Then the asymptotic subword complexity of $\mathbf{u}$ is $\Theta(n^t)$.*

Proof. If $t = 0$, then $\mathbf{u}$ is periodic. Then $p_{\mathbf{u}}(n)$ is ultimately constant.

If not, we denote by $P = \{p_1, ..., p_t\}$ the set of primes p such that $u(p) \neq 1_K, 0_K$ and by q the product of primes where $\mathbf{u}$ takes the value 0_K. The sequence $\mathbf{u}$ is the product of an ultimately periodic sequence and non-ultimately periodic automatic sequences :

$$u(n) = z(n) \prod_{p \in P} (u(p))^{v_p(n)},$$

where $(z(n))_n$ is the sequence defined as $z(n) = 0$ if and only if $u(n) = 0$, $z(n) = 1_K$ otherwise. By Lemma 2 and Theorem 2 we know that $p_{\mathbf{u}} = O(n^t)$.

We consider the subsequence $(w(n))_n = (u(qn+1))_n$. To prove that $p_{\mathbf{u}}(n) = \Omega(n^t)$ we only have to prove that $p_{\mathbf{w}}(u) = \Omega(n^t)$.

If $t = 1$, we denote by p the prime such that $u(p) \neq 1_K, 0_K$ and by a the value of $u(p)$. Then $w(n) = a^{v_p(qn+1)}$. By Lemma 5 we know that $\mathbf{w}$ is not ultimately periodic. So by Theorem 1 we have $p_{\mathbf{w}}(n) \geq n+1$. Therefore $p_{\mathbf{u}} = \Omega(n)$.

If $t \geq 2$, for $i = 1, ..., t$ we define q_i to be $\prod_{j=1, j\neq i}^{t} p_j$, and we consider the sequences $(w_i(n))_n := (w(q_i n))_n = (u(qq_i n+1))_n = (u(p_i)^{v_{p_i}(qq_i+1)})_n$. By Lemma 5 and Theorem 1, $\mathbf{w_i}$ is not ultimately periodic so $\mathbf{w_i}$ at least $n+1$ factors of length n, which we denote by $W_{i,j}$ for $j = 0, ..., n$, and by $\alpha_{i,j}$ their staring position in $\mathbf{w_i}$. We choose an integer N such that for all $i = 1, ..., t$, and all $j = 0, ..., n$, $W_{i,j}$ occurs in the initial segment of $\mathbf{w_i}$ of length N. There exists an integer M such that for all $k = 0, 1, ..., N-1$, all $i = 0, ..., t$, and all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $w_i(k + m \cdot p_i^M) = w_i(k)$. Thus the starting position of $W_{i,j}$ in $\mathbf{w}$ include the set

$$\{q_i\alpha_{i,j} + q_i m p_i^M \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

There exist $r_2, ..., r_t \in \{0, 1, ..., p_1...p_t\}$ such that the cardinality of the set

$$\{(j_1, ..., j_t) \in \{0, 1, ..., n\}^t \mid (q_1\alpha_{1,j_1} - q_2\alpha_{2,j_2}, ..., q_1\alpha_{1,j_1} - q_t\alpha_{t,j_t}) \equiv (r_2, ..., r_t) \mod p_1...p_t\}$$

is at least $\lceil n^t/(p_1^{t-1}p_2...p_t)\rceil$. By Lemma 4 we know that

$$\{(q_1m_1p_1^M - q_2m_2p_2^M, ..., q_1m_1p_1^M - q_tm_tp_t^M) \mid m_1, ..., m_t \in \mathbb{N}\} = (p_1...p_t\mathbb{Z})^{t-1}$$

Therefore $\mathbf{w}$ has at least $\lceil n^t/(p_1^{t-1}p_2...p_t)\rceil$ factors of length $(n \cdot \max\{q_1, ..., q_t\} + p_1...p_t)$. This means that $p_{\mathbf{w}}(n) = \Omega(n)$ and therefore $p_{\mathbf{u}}(n) = \Omega(n)$. □

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2 and 4.

Corollary 1. *Let $(u(n))n$ be a completely multiplicative sequence taking values in a field K. We suppose that the number of prime numbers p such that $u(p) \neq 1_K$ is finite and that among them, for at least two primes p_1 and p_2 we have $(p_1) \neq 0_K$ and $u(p_2) \neq 0_K$. Then $(u(n))_n$ is not k-automatic for any $k \geq 2$.*

Corollary 2. *Let $(u(n))n$ be a completely multiplicative sequence taking values in a field K. We suppose that the number of prime numbers p such that $u(p) = 0_K$ is finite and that there exists an integer d such that the cardinality of the set $\{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid u(p)^d \neq 0_k, 1_K\}$ is finite and at least 2. Then $\mathbf{u}$ is not k-automatic for any $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. By the assumption, the sequence $(u(n)^d)_n$ satisfies the conditions of Corollary 1 and therefore is not k-automatic. This implies that by $\mathbf{u}$ is not k-automatic by Lemma 1. □

In the case where K is the field of complex numbers, there is a more elegant proof of Corollary 1 using the following result in [1] about automatic sequences and Dirichlet series:

Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer and let $(u(n))_n$ be a k-automatic sequence with values in $\mathcal{C}$, then the Dirichlet series

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{u(n)}{n^s}$$

has a meromorphic continuation to the whole complex plane, whose poles (if any) are located at the points

$$s = \frac{\log \lambda}{\log k} + \frac{2im\pi}{\log k} - l + 1,$$

where λ is any eigenvalue of a certain matrix defined from the sequence u, where $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and log is a branch of the complex logarithm.

Proof of Corollary 1 for $K = \mathbb{C}$. We denote by P the set of prime numbers. By the assumption of the corollary we know that

$$P = A \cup B \cup \{p_1, p_2\},$$

where $A = \{p \in P | u(p) = 1\}$, $B = P \backslash (A \cup \{p_1, p_2\})$.

For s such that $\Re(s) > 1$, we consider the Dirichlet series

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{u(n)}{n^s} &= \prod_{p \in P} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{u(p)}{p^s} \right)^i \\
&= \prod_{p \in P} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{u(p)}{p^s}} \\
&= \left(\prod_{p \in A} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p^s}} \right) \left(\prod_{q \in B} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{u(q)}{q^s}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{a}{p_1^s}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{b}{p_2^s}} \right) \\
&= \left(\prod_{p \in P} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p^s}} \right) \left(\prod_{q \in B} \frac{q^s - 1}{q^s - u(q)} \right) \frac{p_1^s - 1}{p_1^s - a} \frac{p_2^s - 1}{p_2^s - b} \\
&= \zeta(s) \left(\prod_{q \in B} \frac{q^s - 1}{q^s - u(q)} \right) \frac{p_1^s - 1}{p_1^s - a} \frac{p_2^s - 1}{p_2^s - b}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the Riemann Zeta function $\zeta(s)$ is meromorphic on the whole complexe plane and the product over B in the last line is finite, the Dirichet series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{u(n)}{n^s}$ has meromorphic continuation on the whole complexe plane. Now we examine the poles of this function. The assumption of automaticity and multiplicativity implies that a and b are roots of unity, therefore the poles of $\frac{p_1^s - 1}{p_1^s - a} \frac{p_2^s - 1}{p_2^s - b}$ are $\{\frac{(\arg(a) + 2n\pi)i}{\log(p_1)} | n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\frac{(\arg(b) + 2m\pi)i}{\log(p_2)} | m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Since the $\zeta(s)$ has no zeros on the imaginary axis, these are also poles of the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{u(n)}{n^s}$. Therefore $(u(n))_n$ cannot be $k-$automatic according to the result cited above.

□

References

[1] J.-P. Allouche, M. Mendès France, J. Peyrière, "Automatic Dirichlet series", J. Number Theory 81 (2000), no. 2, 359–373.

[2] J.-P. Allouche, J. Shallit, "Automatic sequences. Theory, applications, generalizations", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[3] A. Cobham, “Uniform tag sequences”, Math. Systems Theory 6 (1972), 164–192.

[4] M. Morse, G. A. Hedlund. Symbolic dynamics. Amer. J. Math. , 60:815–866, 1938.